

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

COUY GRIFFIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 22-cv-362 KG/GJF

MARCO WHITE, MARK MITCHELL,
and LESLIE LAKIND, *acting under color of*
New Mexico law,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Emergency Motion for leave to File Supplemental Brief and Modify Briefing Schedule. (Doc. 24). Plaintiff filed a Memorandum in Opposition to the Motion. (Doc. 25). Having reviewed the briefing, the Court grants the Motion.

The Court concludes that additional briefing, especially on the issue of abstention, will be helpful for adjudication of this action. The Court also concludes that consolidating Plaintiff's Reply on his Motion for Preliminary Injunction with his Response to the Supplemental briefing promotes efficiency and the orderly consideration of the issues, and that such consolidation falls well within the Court's power to administer and control its docket. *See e.g., Hartsel Springs Ranch of Colorado, Inc. v. Bluegreen Corp.*, 296 F.3d 982, 985 (10th Cir. 2002).

The Court vacates the June 3 deadline for Plaintiff's Reply and hereby sets the following briefing schedule:

1. Defendants' Supplemental Brief due on or before June 10, 2022. The brief shall be limited to eight (8) pages.

2. Plaintiff's reply brief encompassing both a reply to Defendants' Response and a response to the supplemental briefing due on or before June 24, 2022. The brief shall be limited to twenty-four (24) pages, the limit for a response, rather than twelve (12) pages, the ordinary limit for a reply. *See* D.N.M.LR-Civ. 7.5.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE